

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 16-18 have been amended to place the above-referenced application in condition for allowance. In view of these amendments and the following reasoning for allowance, the applicants hereby respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the subject application.

The Section 102 Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-30

In the Final Office Action dated November 26, 2003 (Paper No. 9) issued in the subject application, Claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-30 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Furlan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,337,708 (hereinafter Furlan). The Office Action asserts that Furlan discloses each and every element of the rejected claims. In response, the applicants have amended the rejected claims to make them novel over the Furlan reference.

More particularly, the independent claims in the rejected group (i.e., Claims 1, and 16-18) were each amended to expressly recite that the data associated with each frame region includes an indicator appended to it which identifies what frame and what location in that frame the accompanying frame region data relates to.

It was contended in the Office Action that Furlan teaches the claimed feature in Figs 4-6 and 12; and at col. 5, line 17 - col. 7, line 56; col. 12, lines 6-20; and col. 15-16. However, the applicants can find nothing in these figures, or the cited sections, or any part of Furlan, which mentions an indicator that identifies what frame and what location within that frame the tile is associated with.

The Examiner also contends in the final Office Action that the feature of Furlan whereby each tile position is assigned its own multicast channel, reads on the claimed indicator. In doing so the Examiner apparently is relying on the claim

language where an indicator is:

“associated with the data of each frame region”.

The Examiner interprets this to mean, in its broadest sense, that the indicator may not be an actual part of the encoded data file for the frame region. Thus, it is apparently concluded that Furlan's teaching of assigning data representing a tile region to a multicast channel is equivalent to associating an indicator with the data, even though no physical indicator is taught to be included in the tile itself. In response, the claims have been amended to specifically recite that an indicator is appended to the data representing a frame region, thereby precluding any interpretation that the indicator is not a physical component of the data file.

As explained in the applicants' response to the Office Action dated July 9, 2003 (Paper No. 6), there is nothing in the Furlan teachings that even suggests the applicants claimed indicator. Specifically, Furlan does not teach an indicator that is a physical component of the encoded data file, and which identifies the corresponding video frame of its associated frame region data as well as the location of the frame region within that frame.

A prima facie case of anticipation is established only when the Examiner can show that the cited reference teaches each of the claimed elements of a rejected claim. In view of the amended claim language, it is the applicants belief that the Examiner cannot show that the Furlan reference teaches the claimed feature whereby encoding the frame regions of a video includes creating at least one data file which includes the data associated with each frame region of each frame of the video and an indicator **appended to** the data of each frame region that identifies its corresponding video frame and its location within that frame. Thus, the rejected claims recite a feature that is not taught in cited art, and as such a prima facie case of anticipation cannot be established. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-30 be reconsidered based on the novel claim


language (as exemplified in Claim 1):

" encoding the frame regions of the panoramic video comprises creating at least one data file comprising the data associated with each frame region of each frame of the panoramic video and an indicator **appended to** the data of each frame region that identifies its corresponding panoramic video frame and its location within that frame."

Summary

In summary, it is believed that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-30 is respectfully requested. In addition, allowance of these claims at an early date is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard T. Lyon
Registration No. 37,385
Attorney for Applicant

LYON & HARR, LLP
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, CA 93036
(805) 278-8855